

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
March 5, 2003
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Richard Deuell, Member
John Kolessar, Member
Steve Warren, Member

Bill McEntee, Member
Susan Mortel, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member

Absent

Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman
John Elsinga, Member
Aaron Hopper, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Zoe Lorca, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics Auditorium, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the February 5, 2003, Council Minutes

Bill McEntee moved approval of the minutes as submitted; supported by John Kolessar. Minutes were approved as submitted.

Correspondence and Announcements

Rick Lilly announced that the Work Program had been approved by the State Transportation Commission with one minor amendment dealing with the selection of the data agency and the process that would have to be followed. Mr. Lilly passed out the change to the Council. He also stated the final Work Plan would be emailed to stakeholders and posted on the web site.

1. Update on contracts with regional planning agencies: Chairman Palombo stated that the contracts were in process. He had met with Mr. Lilly and Marsha Small of the Michigan Department of Transportation to put together language for the work to be done by the regions. In addition, they are working on

a draft budget for each region. Chairman Palombo hoped to have a draft available for review by the Council at the next meeting. Mr. Lilly noted that the Governor had issued a new directive indicating that all contracts and contract amendments over \$25,000 are now required to be reviewed and approved by the Ad Board. This could delay implementing the contract revisions with the regional planning agencies.

2. Status of the Executive Secretary: Mr. Lilly indicated that the position of Executive Secretary was still vacant and it was not certain as to when it would be filled.

3. Monthly Report: Mr. Lilly presented the February monthly report. He reported that web site is continuing to be developed and new information is being added. Mr. Lilly also reported that staff had developed a stakeholder mailing list. This group will receive quarterly updates on the Council's activities. Mr. Lilly indicated that if members had names they would like to have added to this mailing list to please submit them to him.

Mr. Lilly reported on the status of the survey. We have received 160 surveys to date. Approximately 54 of those returned were from county road commissions. He said that staff would report on the results of the survey at the April meeting.

National Functional Classification Presentation

Ms. Susan Berquist of MDOT, gave a presentation on the National Functional Classification (NFC) system. Of particular note was that all updates to the system from the 2000 census, as well as those supplied by local agencies, will be included in the next version of the Michigan Geographic Framework. Following the presentation, Mr. Lilly passed out a series of tables and graphs regarding the distribution of miles amongst the NFC classifications.

Committee Reports:

1. Education/Outreach Committee & Administrative Committee: John Kolessar reported on the activities of the two committees. These include:
 - Creation of an activity log to be used by the Council members when making presentations to the public.
 - They are working on resolving a problem with the May 2 reporting deadline in Act 499 as it relates to other reporting dates.
 - The committees are also working on ways to ensure that the data reported is consistent statewide, specifically as to project eligible costs.
2. Data Management Committee: Steve Warren gave the report. He highlighted the following issues discussed by the committee:

- Using the National Bridge Inventory data for reporting on the condition of the bridges on the federal-aid eligible system. The committee feels that only data regarding “structurally deficient” bridges be used and not those classified as “functionally obsolete.” The reason for this is that the first measures structural deficiencies while the latter measures operational deficiencies, and the Council is really more interested in structural needs rather than operational needs.
- The need to have an agreed upon reporting period. The committee came to a consensus to have the reporting period cover a calendar year; January 1 through December 31.
- The PASER categories (1-10) should be combined into 3 reporting categories of: Routine Maintenance (ratings 8-10), Preventive Maintenance (ratings 5-7), and Structural Improvements (ratings 1-4).
- Discussed how road agencies should report the data on an annual basis but did not have a recommendation at this time.
- Decided that the “Pilot Project” should be considered finished and that Macomb County not be added this spring.

Susan Mortel expressed concern that by leaving out “functionally obsolete” bridges, the Council would not be giving a true indication of the total needs and the investment levels needed. Mr. Warren agreed that this needs to be looked at further.

3. Strategic Analysis Committee: Bill McEntee reported for the Strategic Analysis Committee.
 - The committee is studying the strategies used by other states to see which types of data are used to support their strategies.
 - A problem discovered by the committee is that many agencies are using pavement management systems, in a tactical sense, to select projects rather than in a strategic sense to determine long-term investment levels.
 - The committee is recommending that all roads on the federal-aid eligible system be assessed using PASER. Other types of methods can be utilized by individual agencies which are consistent with their particular business practice. Over the course of the next several years the Council will test these other methods against the PASER method.
 - The cost of collecting the PASER data would be covered by the Council.

Proposed Committee Recommendations

1. The Education-Outreach and Administrative committees recommend adoption of the “log” submitted to the Council at the meeting. Moved by John Kolessar, supported by Richard Deuell. Passed, unanimously.

2. The Education-Outreach and Administrative committees reviewed the data chart and changed the category of “total dollars let” to “total dollars awarded” and that it be made clear that these were to include only eligible costs.

The data would cover the reporting period of January 1st through December 31st of each year. The regional planning agencies would collect this information from all road agencies (state and local) within their areas. They would combine this data into a “regional” profile which would be submitted to the Council for the Annual Report. The data would need to be submitted to the Council no later than February 1st of each year. This is necessary to have a draft to the Council by their March meeting. The Data Management Committee, after considerable discussion, recommended that the Council not put information on the number of actual projects in the Annual Report. However, the Council may want to require the reporting of the number of projects for tracking purposes only. The Annual Report is ultimately an “investment” report, not an activity report.

It was moved by Richard Deuell and supported by Steve Warren that the reporting period cover January 1st through December 31st. Motion was approved unanimously.

John Kolessar moved and Kirk Steudle supported that categories for reporting include: “Total Dollars Awarded – Eligible Costs” and “Structures” rather than “Projects.” All other categories would be those as submitted by the Data Management Committee. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. The Strategic Analysis Committee is recommending that all roads on the federal-aid system be assessed using, at this time, at least PASER, and other methods as road agencies determine are appropriate for their individual business processes. All federal-aid eligible roads will get a PASER rating. Road agencies can collect other data as they desire. Over the course of the next several years, the Council will test these other indices against PASER. The cost of collecting PASER will be covered by the Council and not by individual road agencies. The Council will also investigate collecting both sets of data at the same time to determine overall cost-effectiveness.

After considerable discussion, it was moved by John Kolessar and supported by Bill McEntee that the paragraph be changed to read: “The Strategic Analysis Committee recommends that all roads on the federal-aid system be assessed using, at this time, at least PASER, and other methods as road agencies determine are appropriate for their individual business processes. The Council will collect PASER ratings on all federal-aid eligible roads. The cost of collecting this data will be covered by the Council and not by individual road agencies. Road agencies can collect other data as they desire at their own expense. Over the next 3 years the Council will test PASER as a baseline condition assessment method. In addition, the Council will test the correlation between PASER and other rating methods currently being used by state and local road agencies.” Motioned passed unanimously.

4. The Data Management Committee recommends that for the purposes of reporting on bridge condition, that the National Bridge Inventory be used and that only structurally deficient numbers are used. The committee agreed that

“improvement category” needed to be added to bridges. [The bridge improvement categories currently used by MDOT are:

1. Capital Scheduled Maintenance (CSM): Capital expenditures for scheduled/routine type maintenance.
2. Capital Preventive Maintenance (CPM): Work activities focused on the needs of structures in “fair” condition.
3. Rehabilitation
4. Replacement]

After considerable discussion regarding what data should be included in the Council’s report, it was moved by Susan Mortel and supported by Steve Warren to refer this question back to the Data Management Committee. Motion was approved unanimously.

5. The Data Management Committee, regarding Macomb County, recommends that data not be collected separately from the process that will be done in the fall. It was moved by Kirk Steudle and supported by Carmine Palombo to concur in the committee’s recommendation. Motion was approved unanimously.

Discussion: Final Report – “Pilot Project”

The Council recognizes the value of the “Pilot Project,” and that it is now completed.

Mr. Lilly indicated that the draft Annual Report is being finalized and that it will be emailed to members by the end of next week.

In response to a question from Kirk Steudle, Chairman Palombo agreed to write a letter to the Michigan Municipal League and the County Road Association of Michigan letting them know that the Council would be conducting the rating of the roads, and individual agencies should not collect the data and submit a bill to the Council.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p. m.

Executive Secretary